University of California Libraries

UC Shared Microform Collections Review: Final Report

June 9, 2017;Rev. July 17, 2017

Table of Contents

UC Micro Collections Review
Final Report
June 9, 2017

Executive Summary

This team* reviewed microform resources acquired by University of California and Stanford Libraries under a Shared Purchase Program that began in 1976 and continued into the mid-1990s. The team delivered an inventory of resources and made recommendations for managing their future retention, preservation, and access. The recommendations are:

Recommendation 1: That further work be done by a knowledgeable person at each library to learn the whereabouts of the titles on the Not Found spreadsheet and make a final determination on whether or not they exist. If so, the inventory list should be corrected, the resources cataloged and made visible, and the titles covered by subsequent recommendations in this report; if not, the titles should be annotated with the correct status and date.

Recommendation 2: That the Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG) initiate a discussion with the Shared Print Strategy Team (SPST) regarding expanding the UC Shared Print Program to encompass non-print materials, including asking that the governing documents be adapted as necessary so that non-print resources can be designated and retained as UC Shared Resources;

Recommendation 3: That SCLG designate the microform resources acquired with shared funds and listed in the attached inventory as UC Shared Collections; and a standard "shared" note be added to catalog records that do not have one;

Recommendation 4: That SCLG asks the California Digital Library (CDL) to post this report and its attachments and appendices on its website and distribute it to all campuses;

Recommendation 5: That SCLG communicate with the Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB) to ask for their commitment that the Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) will have sufficient climate-controlled space in which to house microform resources for archival and preservation purposes for the long future, and will continue to acquire current standard equipment and maintain staff to provide efficient access to such resources, for example, through scanning on demand.

Recommendation 6: That the UCs retain one copy of all shared purchase microform resources either as a Shared Print in Place (SPiP) resource in a campus library or a UC shared collection resource at one of the RLFs. In the few instances where there are multiple copies of a microform set, the owning campuses should discuss and decide which campus will retain the SPIP copy or deposit into an RLF, and how the other campus will handle its set. The campus whose copy will not be the shared one may retain, offer, deposit, or withdraw their copy as they deem appropriate.

Recommendation 7: That all microform resources are appropriate candidates for deposit into an RLF with the process for deposit being initiated by the library currently holding the set;

Recommendation 8: That special attention be paid to the discoverability of these sets through identification of guides and indexes whether in print, microform, or online and to ensuring there are enough copies throughout the UC Libraries and at the RLFs.

Recommendation 9: That SCLG appoint a team of relevant subject and language experts or microform collection specialists to check with publishers and vendors to gather data on whether digital versions exist, their completeness, and the cost for UC Libraries to purchase them. The data should be provided to the Common Knowledge Group (CKG) chairs so the resources can be discussed and prioritized for potential purchase.

Recommendation 10: That SCLG appoint a team to explore digitization of the guides/indexes for shared microform sets and having them cataloged for all UC Libraries by the Shared Cataloging Program. If guides can be digitized, team members should also consider how to promote them to library staff and how to monitor and report subsequent usage activity of the resources.

Recommendation 11: That SCLG appoint a team to distribute the inventory to relevant Common Knowledge Groups and work in conjunction with them to develop principles and criteria to prioritize digitization of microform resources, including locating copyright holders and developing a rights clearance process, identifying potential partners, and creating a budget for the work. Assessment of resources should include local use and interlibrary loan data (if available), availability in the broader library universe, overall value as research material, etc. Based on the assessment results, the team should choose a digitization partner to explore its services and costs of digitizing.

Background

In 1976 the nine University of California (UC) Libraries initiated a program to jointly fund the purchase of research materials that were too costly for a single campus to acquire. Details of the program are in the *Guidelines for University of California Library Acquisitions with Shared Purchase Funds*[1] in Appendix I. Stanford Library joined the Program in 1979 and nearly four million dollars had been dedicated to it by 1986.[2] These collections, usually focusing on a particular subject or connected with a specific bibliography, are frequently made up of a combination of monographs, serials, government publications, personal papers, and manuscripts. The program added valuable depth and breadth to UC and Stanford Library collections of primary source documents, historical newspapers, and works that were otherwise unavailable.

Initially called the Shared Purchase Program, it has for some time been known as the Shared Collections and Access Program or SCAP. From the beginning until the mid-1990s, the program funded microform sets, aerial photos, and print facsimiles. Large shared microform sets are the subject of this review. Typically, these sets were held by one campus with finding aids or guides purchased for other campuses, thereby making the resources discoverable and accessible via inter-library loan for all the libraries.

In the forty-some years since the program began, microform publishing has declined and user preference has shifted to digital material. The use of microform resources has also declined and some libraries no longer have the equipment to view, print, or scan these formats.   With questions arising from campus libraries about how to manage these collections going forward, the SCLG charged a UC-wide team to review the shared microform collections and recommend options for their future preservation, discovery, and access.

Charge

The team is to inventory the existing shared microform collections, ascertain whether the content is available elsewhere, including digitally, and find out whether storing microform sets at a RLF is possible. Further, the group is to investigate potential options for digitizing microform-only resources and make recommendations for future actions that would ensure

---

[1] University of California, Davis. Library, Collection Development Department records, 1969-2001. *Guidelines for University of California Library Acquisitions with Shared Purchase Funds.* 1981, with revisions. Copy supplied by UC Davis Department of Special Collections.

[2] Buzzard, Marion L. (1986). *Cooperative Acquisitions within a System: The University of California Shared Purchase Program.* Resource Sharing & Information Networks, 2:3, 99-113. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J121v02n03_11 Accessed May 26, 2017

access to the content. The full charge is attached as Appendix II.

Discussion

Inventory: Two incomplete lists of titles were provided and became the basis for compiling an inventory. The lists included titles, the owning library(ies), as well as other data points. These lists were supplemented by searching of local catalogs for 'shared purchase' or 'shared acquisitions' titles with a microform media type. This resulted in a much longer list that includes microform sets, guides to those sets, and non-microform shared purchases. This final list reflects a more complete picture of our collective holdings; however, there may be titles missing for various reasons, including that the "shared" note may have disappeared as catalogs migrated to new systems. It's also possible there were microform purchases made outside of SCAP that were intended to be shared resources but not tracked or indicated as such in any records. A possible instance of this was brought to the team's attention as it was finishing its work. In addition, the focus of this team was on identifying shared microform sets and the list of non-microform resources and guides/indexes is less comprehensive.

This team discussed the charge and developed the data factors needed to support collection management decisions and added them to the spreadsheet. Corrections were made to the inventory as necessary (titles, format, etc.) and specific titles were added for those resources that were described in a general way. For example, "Unpublished music manuscripts from the great English collections" comprised several distinct manuscript collections and their respective guides from different locations in England.

The expanded inventory lists 329 Microform sets, 64 Not Found titles, 110 Non-microform titles, and 38 titles held by Stanford Library on four separate tabs. Stanford Library confirmed its holdings remain in their Library and are serviced under the Shared Purchase Program guidelines. The inventory is attached as an excel spreadsheet as Appendix III.

> **Recommendation 1**: That further work be done by a knowledgeable person at each library to learn the whereabouts of the titles on the Not Found spreadsheet and make a final determination on whether or not they exist. If so, the inventory list should be corrected, the resources cataloged and made visible, and the titles covered by subsequent recommendations in this report; if not, the titles should be annotated with the correct status and date.

The UC Libraries have always shared resources with each other, as well as with the broader academic and public communities through lending. The Shared Purchase Program extended that by coordinating shared purchases of expensive materials which would build a deeper

5

collection for all participants in the program. The *Guidelines* cited above state the purpose of the Shared Purchase Program as follows:

> The Shared Purchase Program has been instituted to acquire materials which, because of their high cost (or anticipated frequency of use), should be shared among the campuses without unnecessary duplication. The program has also been instituted to reduce competition for, and to promote sharing of, manuscript and subject area collections among the various campuses of the University of California. . . . By these means the University of California libraries seek to increase the breadth and depth of the total library resources of the University by using state allocations for library materials as effectively as possible.

Several agreements between campuses to share acquisitions of specific journal titles or subjects were put in place in the 1990s and, more recently, our libraries participate in building retrospective shared print collections locally and nationally. These are documented on the CDL's Shared Print website[3].

There may be some danger of the microform sets purchased under this program being forgotten about as shared resources. They contribute valuable, sometimes unique, content to our collections and they should be stewarded to ensure they remain available and accessible into the future. The team recommends bringing them under the UC Shared Print program umbrella and governed by its policies.

> **Recommendation 2:** That the Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG) initiate a discussion with the Shared Print Strategy Team (SPST) regarding expanding the UC Shared Print Program to encompass non-print materials, including asking that the governing documents be adapted as necessary so that non-print resources can be designated and retained as UC Shared Resources;
>
> **Recommendation 3**: That SCLG designate the microform resources acquired with shared funds and listed in the attached inventory as UC Shared Collections; and a standard "shared" note be added to catalog records that do not have one;
>
> **Recommendation 4**: That SCLG asks the California Digital Library (CDL) to post this report and its attachments and appendices on its website and distribute it to all campuses;

---

[3] CDL Shared Print: http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/

Recommendation 5: That SCLG communicate with the Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB) to ask for their commitment that the Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) will have sufficient climate-controlled space in which to house microform resources for archival and preservation purposes for the long future, and will continue to acquire current standard equipment and maintain staff to provide efficient access to such resources, for example, through scanning on demand.

Holdings elsewhere: Nine UC Libraries (excluding UCSF) are members of the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) which for decades has purchased expensive microform resources on behalf of its members. Titles have been searched in the CRL catalog and annotated on the inventory list. The number of holdings in libraries other than UC, Stanford and CRL has not been determined. CRL holdings are sent to researchers at member libraries on long-term interlibrary loans (six months with unlimited renewals). The CRL's mission is also strongly focused on preservation of resources and their future accessibility. That being said, this team does not consider the existence of CRL copies to support a decision to withdraw copies of shared microform resources from UC Libraries.

RLF Microform Capacity and Services: Depending on their use at the holding campus, it may be possible and desirable to re-locate shared microform sets to a RLF as Shared Collection resources for long-term preservation and access. The inventory indicates that about fifty microform sets and twenty-five guides/indexes are already in an RLF, mostly from Los Angeles and Berkeley. The questions of RLF capability to house and serve microform materials, the process for sending them to an RLF, as well as whether future deposits would count against campus allocations were raised and discussed.

At current rates of deposit NRLF's space for both microfilm and microfiche will last to mid-century, while SRLF's microfilm space will fill in 2018 and microfiche in 2034.   Details are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: RLF Capacity by Material Type and Projected Fill Dates (as of July 2017)

Description	Available Capacity, Items	Available Capacity, Vol. Eqs.	Annual Growth, Vol. Eqs.	Years of Growth Remaining	Projected Fill Date
SRLF: Microfilm	14,235	3,843	2,385	1.0	2018
NRLF: Microfilm	64,322	17,479	580	30.0	2047
SRLF: Microfiche	5,346	364	26	17.0	2034
NRLF: Microfiche	1,785	27,846	818	34.0	2051

RLF staff confirmed they have space to house microform materials.   These are stored in appropriate boxes, trays, shelves or cabinets in areas that are temperature and humidity controlled and both RLFs have HVAC systems that filter incoming air to remove particulates and gasses.

RLF managers and staff also confirmed they have digital equipment to scan and deliver microform documents to library users. If documents are long, the fiche or films are sent to the patron's campus to view using the library's equipment. There are UC campuses that no longer have equipment to view, print, or scan certain kinds of microforms. Patrons from those campuses would need to visit the relevant RLF to access materials, or possibly make arrangements to view them at a different (nearby) UC campus library that has the equipment.

NRLF has a self-service digital microform scanner for on-site visitors. SRLF currently has equipment for on-site users to make print copies from microforms; however, digital equipment is expected to be installed in a few months.

Whether deposits of shared microform sets into RLFs would count against campus quotas is a question decided on a case-by-case basis by the Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB). Factors that have influenced past decisions include whether or not the collection had some official UC shared designation, the ability of the RLFs to accommodate the collections, the cost of accessioning, adequate access/discoverability mechanisms, and the value to campuses generally. Any request to deposit should incorporate an analysis of access needs and considerations for the RLFs. The ERIC documents microfiche set is the most recent example of a case where the collection was accessioned at NRLF with UC Berkeley covering transportation costs and other costs waived. The ERIC document proposal to SLFB has been made available as an example and is found in Appendix IV. Questions regarding the process as well as any proposal should be sent to the relevant RLF Director who will take it to the SLFB for discussion and decision.

For regular microform deposits, RLF staff confirmed that depositing libraries generally contact them when they want to deposit microform to determine if space is available and to help coordinate the deposit. Libraries may also want to know if they can send the storage cabinets (for microfiche) or if any storage charges apply. Small amounts of microform are usually incorporated with regular print deposits.

> **Recommendation 6:** That the UCs retain one copy of all shared purchase microform resources either as a Shared Print in Place (SPiP) resource in a campus library or a UC shared collection resource at one of the RLFs. In the few instances where there are multiple copies of a microform set, the owning campuses should discuss and decide which campus will retain the SPIP copy or deposit into an RLF, and how the other

campus will handle its set. The campus whose copy will not be the shared one may retain, offer, deposit, or withdraw their copy as they deem appropriate.

Recommendation 7: That all microform resources are appropriate candidates for deposit into an RLF with the process for deposit being initiated by the library currently holding the set;

Recommendation 8: That special attention be paid to the discoverability of these sets through identification of guides and indexes whether in print, microform, or online and to ensuring there are enough copies throughout the UC Libraries and at the RLFs.

Digital availability: To discover if there were digital versions of these sets, searches were performed in local catalogs, Melvyl, CRL, and Google. Some resources have migrated to digital versions and UC Libraries have a Tier 1 subscription, for example, the American Statistical Index, available through ProQuest's *Statistical Insights* database. In a few cases, the full text is now available via HathiTrust, such as *La décade philosophique, littéraire et politique*, 1794-1807 and *Russkii viestnik,* 1856-1905. Some titles are freely available from the Internet Archive or other websites.

The targets searched are not exhaustive and further searching by subject and language experts or microform collection specialists will be necessary to conclusively determine whether digital versions are available and at what cost.

Recommendation 9: That SCLG appoint a team of relevant subject and language experts or microform collection specialists to check with publishers and vendors to gather data on whether digital versions exist, their completeness, and the cost for UC Libraries to purchase them. The data should be provided to the Common Knowledge Group (CKG) chairs so the resources can be discussed and prioritized for potential purchase.

Digitizing microform-only resources: Discussions about digitizing microform resources quickly led to many questions about criteria for digitization, as well as whether there is any UC in-house capacity to do this. Recognizing that the content of these resources is trapped in an old technology, it is tempting to say all should be digitized and that digitizing would increase their value and expand the usage exponentially. However, these resources have to be considered within the whole corpus of UC collections that could or should be digitized. A larger conversation will be needed to decide on principles and criteria to decide priorities for digitization. If digitization is to go ahead, there will need to be a process for identifying rights owners and obtaining the necessary clearances, and identifying funding options. Finally, there

would have to be a systemwide commitment to fund the work. SCLG would need to decide the process to use for obtaining such a commitment.

Criteria for digitization would include usage, both in-house and interlibrary loan, and campus program need. The number and holdings in the broader research library community is certainly a factor, at it may be more urgent to digitize lesser held titles than widely-held titles. There may also be external factors that support digital conversion, such as pressure to eliminate the microform collection to free up space for another purpose or because functional equipment is no longer available to view microform materials.

Discoverability of the content in microform sets may be a barrier to use. The guides or indexes are typically in print or microform which may hamper discovery and lead to an underuse of these materials. If it were possible to digitize the guides and made them available through all campus libraries, there may be startling increases in usage of some of these resources which would provide valuable evidence to inform decisions about which sets would merit digitization.

> **Recommendation 10**: That SCLG appoint a team to explore digitization of the guides/indexes for shared microform sets and having them cataloged for all UC Libraries by the Shared Cataloging Program. If guides can be digitized, team members should also consider how to promote them to library staff and how to monitor and report subsequent usage activity of the resources.

Potential digitization partners include the Internet Archive, the CRL, commercial vendors, and newer entities, such as Reveal Digital. The Reveal Digital model has many libraries funding digitization of a defined set of materials with the intention they will become open access resources soon after digitization is complete. Reveal Digital's model also includes rights clearance services. Within the UCs, there is a fee-based imaging service[4] operated by the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) that could be investigated as an in-house partner. For all potential partners, it will be important to determine what our requirements are and if the product meets them, including if the files are of an acceptable preservation quality and backed up as part of the service. If not, determine whether CDL's Merritt service could be used.

> **Recommendation 11:** That SCLG appoint a team to distribute the inventory to relevant Common Knowledge Groups and work in conjunction with them to develop principles and criteria to prioritize digitization of microform resources, including locating copyright holders and developing a rights clearance process, identifying potential partners, and creating a budget for the work. Assessment of resources should include local use and interlibrary loan data (if available), availability in the broader library universe, overall

---

4 SRLF Imaging Services: http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/imaging-services

value as research material, etc. Based on the assessment results, the team should choose a digitization partner to explore its services and costs of digitizing.

Conclusion

The Shared Print and subsequent SCAP programs were successful in adding a rich set of microform resources to the UC and Stanford Library collections. As these formats are less used in the digital information environment it is timely for SCLG to bring these collections forward to be managed under the current UC Library policies for shared resources. In this way, the materials will remain available, discoverable, and accessible into the future.

*UC Shared Microforms Review Team

Sam Dunlap, UCSD
Belen Fernandez, UCD
Becki Imamoto, UCI
Julia Kochi, UCSF & Shared Content Leadership Group Liaison
Jean McKenzie, (UCB) NRLF (Chair)
Kathryn Ombao, SRLF
Kerry Scott, UCSC & Shared Print Liaison